



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,703	08/16/2001	Gregory Booker	JBP-561	3432
27777	7590	11/04/2004		
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003				
EXAMINER DELCOTTO, GREGORY R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1751				

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/931,703

Applicant(s)

BOOKER ET AL

Examiner

Gregory R. Del Cotto

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26 and 34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 30-33 and 35-37 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-25 and 27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-37 are pending. Applicant's arguments filed 8/6/04 have been entered.

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-25, 17-33, and 35-37 in the reply filed on 8/6/04 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 26 and 34 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 8/6/04.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

2. The following objections/rejection(s) as set forth in the Office action mailed 8/6/04 have been withdrawn:

The rejection of claims 1-9, 11, 15, 17-20, 24, 25, 27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 95/00116 has been withdrawn in favor of a new rejection of these claims over WO 95/00116 under 35 USC 102(b) as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1751

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9, 11-25, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steer (US 6,627,585).

A mousse-forming cleansing shampoo composition having improved conditioning performance comprising a foamable concentrate containing at least one surfactant, dispersed particles of a water-insoluble conditioning agent having a particle size of 1 micron or greater; an aqueous carrier and an aerosol. See Abstract. Hair conditioning oily or fatty materials are preferred conditioning agents in compositions for adding shine to the hair and also enhancing dry combing and dry hair feel. Suitable fatty esters are characterized by having at least 10 carbon atoms, and include esters with hydrocarbyl chains derived from fatty acids or alcohols, e.g., monocarboxylic acid esters, polydic alcohol esters, and di- and tricarboxylic acid esters. The monocarboxylic acid ester includes isopropyl isostearate, hexyl laurate, isohexyl laurate, oleyl adipate. Di- and trialkyl and alkenyl esters of carboxylic acids can also be used. These include for ester

Art Unit: 1751

of C4-C8 dicarboxylic acids such as esters C1-C22 esters of succinic acid, glutaric acid, etc. Particularly preferred fatty esters are mono-, di-, and triglycerides, more specifically the mono-, di-, triesters of glycerol and long chain carboxylic acids such as C1-C22 carboxylic acids. Note that, the Examiner asserts that the esters as taught by Steer would be encompassed by the broad terminology of "mono, di- and tri- ester" as recited by the instant claims. The hair conditioning oily or fatty material is typically present at a present at a level of from 0.05% to 10% by total weight of oily or fatty material based on the total weight of the foamable concentrate. See column 7, lines 1-69.

The compositions may also contain a surfactant. Suitable surfactants include anionic and nonionic surfactants. Amphoteric and zwitterionic cleansing surfactants include alkyl amine oxide, alkyl betaines, alkyl amidopropyl betaines, etc. The total amount of surfactant is generally from 3 to 50% by weight of the foamable concentrate. See column 9, lines 13-20. Additionally, the compositions may contain a deposition polymer for the dispersed particles of conditioning agent. Suitable cationic deposition polymers include copolymers of vinyl monomeers having cationic amine or quaternary ammonium functionalities. Other cationic deposition polymers that can be used include cationic guar gum derivatives such as guar hydroxypropyltrimonium chloride, etc. See column 9, line 13 to column 10, line 60.

Steer does not specifically teach a detergent composition containing a cationic polymer, a diester or triester emollient, a monoester emollient, a cleansing surfactant

Art Unit: 1751

and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a detergent composition containing a cationic polymer, a diester or triester emollient, a monoester emollient, a cleansing surfactant and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Steer suggest a detergent composition containing a cationic polymer, a diester or triester emollient, a monoester emollient, a cleansing surfactant and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1-9, 11-25, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al (US 5,837,661).

Evans et al teach hair conditioning shampoo compositions comprising from about 5% to about 50% by weight of a deterative surfactant, from about 0.05% to about 10% by weight of a silicone hair conditioning agent, from about 0.1% to about 10% by weight of a suspending agent, from about 0.025% to about 1.5% by weight of selected polyalkylene glycols, and water, and optionally one or more additional materials known for use in shampoo or conditioning compositions. See Abstract. The surfactant concentration ranges from about 5% to about 50% by weight and suitable surfactants include anionic surfactants, nonionic surfactants, amphoteric and zwitterionic

Art Unit: 1751

surfactants, etc. See column 2, line 50 to column 6, line 69. Suitable suspending agents include ethylene glycol esters of fatty acids such as ethylene glycol stearates, both mono- and distearate, long chain esters of long chain fatty acids (stearyl stearate, cetyl palmitate), glyceryl esters, long chain esters of long chain alkanol amides, ethylene glycol esters of long chain carboxylic acids, etc. Additionally, cationic polymers for use as hair conditioning agents having a weight average molecular weight of from about 5000 to about 10 million, and will generally have cationic, nitrogen-containing moieties such as quaternary ammonium or cationic amino moieties, and mixtures thereof. See column 17, line 65 to column 68, line 15.

Evans et al does not specifically teach a detergent composition containing a cationic polymer, a diester or triester emollient, a monoester emollient, a cleansing surfactant and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a detergent composition containing a cationic polymer, a diester or triester emollient, a monoester emollient, a cleansing surfactant and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Evans et al suggest a detergent composition containing a cationic polymer, a diester or triester emollient, a monoester emollient, a cleansing surfactant and the other requisite

Art Unit: 1751

components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1-9, 11, 15, 17-20, 24, 25, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 95/00116.

'116 teaches a system for cleansing the skin comprising a hydrophobic diamond-mesh sponge and a liquid cleansing and moisturizing composition with excellent lather in the same washing and rinsing operation. The system provides improved lather and overall acceptability for mild liquid cleansing compositions which contain moisturizers and especially for those which would otherwise have marginal lather. See Abstract. The liquid cleanser can contain from about 0.5% to about 15% of a lipophilic emollient moisturizer selected from the group consisting of esters of fatty acids, glycerin mono-, di-, and tri-esters, epidermal and sebaceous hydrocarbons such as cholesterol, cholesterol esters, etc. Additionally, surfactants may be used in the compositions and suitable surfactants include anionic, nonionic, amphoteric, zwitterionic, and cationic. See page 8, lines 1-30. The liquid cleanser can be made by using from 0.1% to 5% of a skin moisturizing cationic polymer selected from the group consisting of cationic polysaccharides and derivatives, etc. See page 11, lines 1-30. Note that, '116 teaches the use of Polyquaternium-10 as a suitable conditioning agent. See page 15, lines 1-5.

Specifically, '116 teaches a cleansing composition containing 49% water, 0.22% stearic acid, 15% glycerin, 7% propylene glycol, 6% sodium lauroyl sarcosinate, 0.75 cetyl ricinoleate, 0.6% Polyquaternium-10, 0.6% fragrance, 1.0% ethyleneglycol

Art Unit: 1751

distearate, 0.8% preservatives, 0.75% petrolatum, etc. The Examiner asserts that '116 discloses the claimed invention with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

Accordingly, the broad teachings of '116 anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Claims 12-14, 16, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 95/00116.

'116 are relied upon as set forth above. However, '116 does not teach, with sufficient specificity, a detergent composition containing the specific ester in addition to the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a detergent composition containing the specific ester in addition to the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of '116 suggest a detergent composition containing the specific ester in addition to the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1751

Claims 30-33 and 35-37 are allowed.

None of the references of record, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a composition containing the requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-9, 11-25, and 29 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 20 of copending Application No. 09/954335. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 20 of 09/954335 encompasses the material limitations of the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 1751

With respect to Steer, Evans et al, or WO95/00116, Applicant states that these references fail to teach or suggest combining a cationic polymer, a monoester compound, a cleansing surfactant, and an emollient selected from diesters, triester, or combinations thereof to achieve a composition of the claimed invention. Applicant states that these references disclose vast laundry lists of potential components which may be used to form an innumerable number of compositions. In response, note that, the Examiner maintains that the teachings of Steer, Evans, or '116 suggest the claimed composition; the instant claims are also broad and are drawn to a large and vast number of compositions. Note that, the specific embodiments of Steer and Evans are drawn to similar compositions as recited by the instant claims and clearly one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated from the teachings of Steer and Evans to formulate the claimed invention. Additionally, as now set forth above and after further consideration, the Examiner asserts that the teachings of '116 are sufficient to anticipate the claimed invention.

With respect to the Declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.132, this is insufficient to place the instant claims in condition for allowance. Note that, the Declaration explains in detail the comparative data presented in the specification and asserts that compositions prepared in accordance with the claimed invention provide unexpected and superior results in comparison to those compositions falling outside the scope of the claimed invention. First, secondary considerations such as comparative data cannot be used to overcome a rejection made under 35 USC 102 as now set forth above. Secondly, this comparative data is not persuasive since the showing is not

Art Unit: 1751

commensurate in scope with the claimed invention; instant claim 1 is a broad claim with no proportions and covers a large number of potential combinations while Applicant makes a comparison to only one embodiment falling within the scope of the instant claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.


Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Gregory R. Del Cotto
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

GRD

November 1, 2004